



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/098,522	03/18/2002	Takashi Yanagisawa	112306	6245

25944 7590 07/22/2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC  
P.O. BOX 19928  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER

LISH, PETER J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1754

DATE MAILED: 07/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/098,522

Applicant(s)

YANAGISAWA ET AL.

Examiner

Peter J Lish

Art Unit

1754

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4-5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 1754

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Double Patenting*

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 1-7 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-7 of copending Application No. 10/098,379. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 1-7 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-7 of copending Application No. 10/098,103. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-8 and 10-11 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 and 13-19 of copending Application No. 10/098,379, claims 1-9 and 19 of copending Application No. 10/098,103 , claims 1-8 of copending Application No. 10/098,396, claims 1-12 of copending Application No. 10/098,312, and claims 1-9 of copending Application No. 10/098,461. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it is expected that the carbon nanofibers of the present invention have the claimed properties of the carbon nanofibers of the above copending applications and vice versa, because no difference is seen between the production and treatment of the nanofibers of the instantly claimed invention and those of the above copending applications.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-8 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Geus et al. (EP 0198558 A2) with reference to Endo et al. (“Structural characterization of cup-stacked-type nanofibers...”).

Art Unit: 1754

Geus et al. teaches a vapor grown carbon fiber with tens to hundreds of stacked crystalline graphite layers forming a herring-bone, or stacked conical, structure. It is seen that the carbon layers have a large ring at the top end and a small ring at the bottom end in the axial direction, as well as a hollow core, or canal (Figure 2).

It is not explicitly taught that carbon layers are exposed at the large ring ends and the small ring ends. It is expected that the fiber of Geus meets these limitations because Geus teaches that the metal particles, as well as any substrate or film materials, may be removed by acid treatment, thereby exposing the carbon layers of both the large ring edges and the small ring edges.

Regarding claims 6-7, Geus et al. does not explicitly teach that the large ring ends and small ring ends have minute irregularities at the level of atoms. This is expected because it is very common for carbon nanofiber or nanotube layers to have irregularities. Furthermore, Endo et al. teach a vapor grown, stacked cone, graphitic nanofiber. Endo et al. teach that there are disordered wavy regions, or irregularities, along the fiber's axis, possible due to the relaxation of carbon layers as a result of cooling. It is thus expected that the vapor grown nanofibers of Geus et al. contain these irregularities, as they too are vapor grown and cooled.

Regarding claim 5, Geus et al. does not explicitly teach that the carbon nanofibers have an outer surface area with at least 2% being made up of edges of the hexagonal carbon layers. It is expected that the nanofibers of Geus et al. will have this property, however, as no difference is seen between the nanofibers of Geus et al. and those of the instantly claimed invention.

Regarding claims 10-11, no difference is seen between the carbon nanofibers of Geus et al. and the electrode material of the instantly claimed invention.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geus et al. as applied above, and further in view of Ikeda et al. (WO 95/07551).

Geus et al. teaches that the carbon nanofibers can be used, by virtue of their excellent mechanical and electrochemical properties, for the manufacture of electrodes for electrochemical applications. Geus et al. do not explicitly teach the use of the carbon nanofibers for the anode or cathode electrode material of a lithium secondary battery.

Ikeda et al. teaches a lithium secondary battery with electrodes containing carbon fibrils as both the anode material and the cathode material. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of invention to use the carbon nanofibers of Geus et al. in the process of forming a lithium battery, as taught by Ikeda et al., in order to take advantage of the mechanical and electrical properties of the nanofibers of Geus et al.

Regarding claim 9, it is inherent in the use of a lithium battery containing the carbon nanotubes of Geus et al. that electrolyte is introduced and held in the hollow core.

Art Unit: 1754


***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J Lish whose telephone number is 703-308-1772. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-6:00 Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman can be reached on 703-308-3837. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-305-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

PL  
June 26, 2003



STUART L. HENDRICKSON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER